REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 15, 2007. Reconsideration is requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Drawing Objections

Fig. 4 is objected to because the reference numeral 444 is not described in the specification. The specification has been amended to include this reference numeral.

Fig. 5 is objected to because of incorrect references in the specification to non-existent reference numerals 551 and 512. These are typographical errors, and have been corrected by the above amendment.

Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to because it ends in a semicolon. This is a typographical error, and is corrected by the above amendment.

Claim Rejections

Independent claims 1, 24 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Madour (U.S. 6,904,025.) These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 24 and 41 each recite methods for handling queued data when a mobile device goes out of communication with a wireless network and then reestablishes communication with the same wireless network. As explained in the Background section, these methods address the problem of maintaining invalid or out-of-context queued data when communication with the wireless network is interrupted, for example when the mobile loses coverage. The Madour reference, however, teaches a method for keeping a session active and connected when a mobile device roams from one wireless network to a different wireless

network. Accordingly, claims 1, 24 and 41, as filed, are patentably distinct from the cited Madour reference. Nonetheless, in order to further distinguish over the Madour reference, claims 1, 24 and 41 have been amended to make it even more clear that the claimed methods relate to the deletion of queued data when communication is interrupted and then re-established with the same wireless network.

Independent claim 51 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour in view of Himmel. Claim 51 recites executable network management program code that performs the method of claim 41. Claim 51 and its dependent claims are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 41.

For at least these reasons, the patent owner submits that independent claims 1, 24, 41 and 51, along with their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the cited references. Claims 1-56 are therefore in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

_____
Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506

</div>